

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

UNITED STATES of AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

V.

Crim. No.1:19-CR-0438-RDB

JAMIE CLEMONS,

Defendant.

OBJECTION TO COURTS ORDER GRANTING AN EXTENTION OF TIME
WITHOUT SERVICE OF GOVERNMENTS MOTION

Mr.Clemons objects to this granting of an extention of time without service of motion on defendant.See Doc:201.Courts order.

Mr.Clemons contends that the court never allowed him to respond to the governments request for said extention of time.

The government contends that the A.U.S.A.,Marry Switzer does not work in the district of Baltimore anymore and contends this is good cause to grant an extention.The government has not attached an AFFIDAVIT proving the fact that she no longer works at the time of filing this said petition.

This court granted orders to comply with said time requirements of the court and the government failed to comply with this courts order.

Mr.Clemons bases his complaint on why he believes the government is in fact acting in bad faith.The fact that the government failed to disclose the fact that there was a third contributor of DNA that was later discovered by an independent expert.

The failure to rule out all factors that concerned the unpermitted

remodels as it pertained to the bar in this case. The A.T.F. agent ran afoul of his investigation and just determined it was the defendant in this case. He failed to investigate the fact of the unpermitted remodels in the case of the bar.

The DNA that was discovered in the glove could of in fact been transferred through contact with another person and should not have been allowed under FED.R.EVID.403 because this could not be accepted as fact due to transfer DNA.

Mr. Clemons contends that his objection is based on misconduct by the government due to the fact that they in fact tried to conceal material evidence in this case in violation of BRADY.

Mr. Clemons enters McClenny V. Meadows and another decision by the same judge who issued his opinion as to and how he in fact entered evidence. See Exhibits 1 and 2 attached.

This was an error of law that induced defendant into his plea of guilty by this court.

If the government submits an AFFIDAVIT proving that at the time of filing this petition that the A.U.S.A., Ms. Switzer was not there to accept said petition during the courts order to respond to this habeas corpus petition then there is no problem. But if she was there then he objects to this order granting this extension of time and the time to respond should in fact be waived for failure to comply with this courts order.

Mr. Clemons asks this honorable court to be fair and not in favor of the government as this courts impartiality is in doubt in this case. If this court cannot act as an impartial fair court then your honor should in fact recuse itself from proceeding any further under 28 USC 144 and 455 of the United States Code.

Mr. Clemons contends that he in fact should be allowed to receive a more favorable disposition if in fact the government fails to provide a AFFIDAVIT by the A.U.S.A. who accepted thew initial filing in this case.



JAMIE CLEMONS
FCI Cumberland
Po Box 1000
Cumberland, MD 21501-
1000


CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

A copy of this motion to object was sent by regular US

Mail to:

United States Attorney's Office
36. s. charles st.
Baltimore, MD 21201

on this ^{2nd} ~~blank~~ ----- of February 2024.


Jamie Clemons